

App. No. 09/785,942

Amendment dated April 28, 2006

Reply to Final Office Action of March 2, 2006

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 2, 2006 rejected Claims 1-4 and 6-23. Claims 1, 10-12 and 15 are amended. No new matter has been added. In light of the amendments and the following remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance because none of the cited references anticipate nor make obvious the claimed invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,717 issued to *Kloba* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,336 issued to *Multer* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,820 issued to *Wells*. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a "computer-readable medium on a mobile computing device having computer-executable components for managing a message within a mobile device, comprising: a main application in communication with a messaging component and a table, wherein: the messaging component is configured to receive a first message that is specifically formatted for communication with the messaging component, the first message is associated with a class identifier that distinguishes the first message from other messages formatted for communication with a different messaging component, the messaging component is configured to pass a notice to handle the first message to the main application using a standard interface, the notice is in a standardized message format and includes the class identifier associated with the first message, the main application is configured to query the table to identify a message form registered to handle messages associated with the class identifier such that the identified message form is configured to handle messages formatted for communication with the message component, the main application is configured to instantiate the identified message form, pass the first message to the instantiated message form and display the instantiated message form with the first message, the messaging component is further configured to receive a second message and pass the second message to the instantiated message form, and the main application is further configured to display the instantiated message form with the second message without having to create a new message form, wherein the first message is not displayed with the instantiated message form."

App. No. 09/785,942
Amendment dated April 28, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of March 2, 2006

Kloba is directed to “enabling web content...to be loaded on mobile devices...[to allow] users of mobile devices to operate with such web content on their mobile devices in an interactive manner while in an off-line mode” (Abstract). *Kloba* discloses a notification module, a layout and rendering module, a forms module, a user interface, a client extension interface, and a database module. “The notification module sends objects to clients beyond objects related to channels associated with client.” Col. 10, lines 5-6. The “[l]ayout and rendering module controls the processing of data objects on [the] client, such as the layout and rendering of data objects on [the] client.” Col. 10, lines 66-67 and Col. 11, line 1. “The forms module controls and manages forms.” Col. 11, line 12. “The user interface...enables users to interact with [the] client and functions and modules provided by the client.” Col. 11, lines 23-25. “The client extension interface enables modules...to operate in or work with the client...” Col. 11, lines 34-35. “The database module controls access to databases associated with the client.” Col. 12, lines 3-4.

Multer is directed to a system for transferring and synchronizing data between two devices. “[T]he system comprises store and forward technology which utilizes... differencing technology to implement services via a public or private network, such as the Internet.” (col. 5, lines 22-25) A system data store includes “a representation of a previous state of application data in an application data store” (Abstract). A difference engine generates “difference information associated with a change to [the] application data store” (Abstract). An application interface interprets “application data for the difference engine” (Abstract).

Wells is directed to real-time SMS application messaging using an SMSC-linked server. A method for operating a wireless mobile station includes “parsing the SMS message to locate an Application Identifier entry;... determining from the Application Identifier entry if the mobile station supports the identified application;... starting the application and displaying the data entry with a second display format specified by the application” (Abstract).

The limitations found in Applicant’s amended Claim 1 are not found in any of the cited prior art references. For example, neither *Kloba*, *Multer*, *Wells*, nor any combination thereof teach “the main application is configured to instantiate the identified message form, pass the first message to the instantiated message form and display the instantiated message form with the first message, the messaging component is further configured to receive a second message

App. No. 09/785,942
Amendment dated April 28, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of March 2, 2006

and pass the second message to the instantiated message form, and the main application is further configured to display the instantiated message form with the second message without having to create a new message form, wherein the first message is not displayed with the instantiated message form." Moreover, none of the references cited in the Office Action anticipate nor make obvious the invention claimed in Claim 1. Since there are limitations in amended Claim 1 that are not found in *Kloba*, *Multer*, *Wells*, or any of the other cited references of record, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable.

Furthermore, Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend from Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Thus, Claims 2-4 and 6-9 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

The limitations found in Applicant's amended Claim 10 are not found in any of the cited prior art references. For example, neither *Kloba*, *Multer*, *Wells*, nor any combination thereof teach "displaying the instantiated message form with the first message; receiving a second message over the transport interface; passing the second message to the instantiated message form; and displaying the instantiated message form with the second message without having to create a new message form, wherein the first message is not displayed with the instantiated message form." Moreover, none of the references cited in the Office Action anticipate nor make obvious the invention claimed in Claim 10. Since there are limitations in amended Claim 10 that are not found in *Kloba*, *Multer*, *Wells*, or any of the other cited references of record, Claim 10 is proposed to be allowable.

Furthermore, Claims 11-14 depend from Claim 10. As discussed above, Claim 10 is proposed to be allowable. Thus, Claims 11-14 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 10 is allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

The limitations found in Applicant's amended Claim 15 are not found in any of the cited prior art references. For example, neither *Kloba*, *Multer*, *Wells*, nor any combination thereof teach "the application is further configured to display the instantiated message form object with the first communication message, the message transport is further configured to receive a second communication message and pass the second communication message to the instantiated message form object, and the application is further configured to display the

App. No. 09/785,942
Amendment dated April 28, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of March 2, 2006

instantiated message form object with the second communication message without having to create a new message form object, wherein the first communication message is not displayed with the instantiated message form object." Moreover, none of the references cited in the Office Action anticipate nor make obvious the invention claimed in Claim 15. Since there are limitations in amended Claim 15 that are not found in *Kloba*, *Multer*, *Wells*, or any of the other cited references of record, Claim 15 is proposed to be allowable.

Furthermore, Claims 16-23 depend from Claim 15. As discussed above, Claim 15 is proposed to be allowable. Thus, Claims 16-23 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 15 is allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.


For at least the reasons stated above, it is believed that the rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6-23 under 35 USC § 103 (a) is overcome and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
206.342.6200
JJF/ab


John J. Farrell
Registration No. 57,291
Direct Line: 206.342.6261

